



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,663	04/11/2001	Anthony J. Polak	LFS-5044	1850
7590 02/27/2006			EXAMINER	
PETER GLUCK GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP 650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE SUITE 1700 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			YANG, NELSON C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/832,663	Applicant(s) POLAK ET AL.	
	Examiner Nelson Yang	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19, 20, 23-26, 28-32, 34-44, 46 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19, 20, 23-26, 28-32, 34-44, 46 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 21, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment of claims 1 and 44 is acknowledged and has been entered.
3. Applicant's cancellation of claims 18, 21, 22, 27, 33, and 45 is acknowledged and has been entered.
4. Claims 1-17, 19-20, 23-26, 28-32, 34-44, 46, 47 are currently pending.

Rejections Withdrawn

5. Applicant's arguments, see p.9, filed November 21, 2005, with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 21, 22, 27, 28, 33, and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the

Art Unit: 1641

subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-17, 19-20, 23-26, 29, 34-44, 46, 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Schultz [US 6,256,522] in view of Krauth [US 4,954,435] and further in view of Vo-Dinh [US 5,864,397].

With respect to claim 1-4, 7-8, 19, 20, 23-26, 29, Schultz teaches a receptor material, Concanavalin A covalently attached to Rhodamine dye molecules, analog analyte comprising dextran covalently attached to fluorescein dye molecules located within a transparent capsule comprising a semi-permeable membrane comprising cellulose or polysulfone (column 10, lines 21-37, claim 1). Schultz further teaches a pH indicator located within the capsule (column 11, lines 1-5, claim 1), as well as a second dye of a second wavelength different from the first wavelength (column 13, lines 15-20). The rhodamine quenches emission fluorescence from the fluorescein (column 10, lines 38-45). With respect to claim 4, the receptor material may be immobilized to a gel such as polyethylene glycol within the chamber (column 8, lines 11-27). Schultz fails to specifically teach using the pH indicator or a second dye as a reference dye, or that the binding substrate has a molecular imprint of the analyte.

Krauth, however, teaches that in fluorescence assays, using a ratio of light signals, one signal being the reporter signal, and the other being the reference signal, provides a correction mechanism for obviating such variables such as fluctuation in the lamp output, variation in tube position, diameter, or optical quality (column 3, lines 50-61).

Vo-Dinh further teaches the use of a molecular imprint material designed to concentrate specific compounds of interest for improved sensitivity (column 6, lines 63-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to use the pH indicator as a reference dye as suggested by Krauth in the device of Schultz et al, in order to obviate such variables such as fluctuation in the lamp output, variation in tube position, diameter, or optical quality when detecting the presence of analytes. It would have further been obvious to use a molecular imprint material, as suggested by Vo-Dinh, in the device of Schultz, in order to concentrate specific compounds of interest for improved sensitivity.

8. With respect to claims 5-6, although neither Schultz nor Krauth teaches a reference covalently bonded to the membrane or in the membrane, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time was made to have the reference covalently bonded to the membrane or in the membrane, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, USPQ 70.

9. With respect to claims 9-12, Schultz teaches that the analyte and receptor may bind to form an analyte-receptor complex (column 6, lines 40-50) and comprise dextran (column 10, lines 20-37).

10. With respect to claims 13-17, Schultz teaches that the receptor material can be immobilized to a gel such as polyacrylamide (column 8, lines 20-28). Schultz further teaches that rhodamine dye molecules can be attached to the receptor material for quenching fluorescence (column 10, lines 25-45).

11. With respect to claims 34-36, Schultz teaches that the semi-permeable membrane comprising cellulose or polysulfone (column 10, lines 21-37, claim 1)

Art Unit: 1641

12. With respect to claim 37, Schultz teaches that the analyte-permeable membrane may also have a reflector comprising metallic particles immobilized on the surface of an ultrafiltration membrane (column 10, lines 1-10).

13. With respect to claims 38-39, Schultz teaches that the analyte being measured is glucose (column 10, line 25).

14. With respect to claims 40-43, while Schultz do not teach what the ratio of the empty space encapsulated by the capsule to a volume occupied by the binding substrate is, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranged involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Furthermore, since applicant has not discussed any unexpected improvements or results using ratios between 0.05 and 5, between 0.5 and 3, or 1, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have used ratios between 0.05 and 5, between 0.5 and 3, or 1 through normal optimization techniques.

15. With respect to claims 44, 46, 47, the sensor unit may be placed underneath the skin (column 7, lines 27-36), illuminated with a laser (column 7, lines 38-45), and measuring absorption of light, including ultraviolet, visible or infrared (column 7, lines 15-25).

16. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz [US 6,256,522] in view of Krauth [US 4,954,435] and Vo-Dinh [US 5,864,397], as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ferri et al [Ferri et al, Direct eye visualization of Cfluorescence for immunocytochemistry and in situ hybridization, 2000, J Hist Cytochem, 48(3), 437-444]

The combination of Schultz, Vo-Dinh and Krauth teach the use of a reference, as discussed above, but do not teach the use of cyanine dyes such as Cy5.

Art Unit: 1641

Ferri et al, however, teach that Cy5 provides a distinct fluorescent signal that can easily be separated from that of many other fluorochromes (p.437, col.1). Ferri et al further teach that a distinct advantage of Cy5 is the low autofluorescence found in many cells and tissues in the above wavelength range (p.437, col.1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to use Cy5 as a reference in the device of Schultz, Krauth et al, and Vo-Dinh, as suggested by Ferri et al, in order to provide a distinct fluorescent signal that can be easily separated from other fluorochromes.

17. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz [US 6,256,522] in view of Krauth [US 4,954,435] and Vo-Dinh [US 5,864,397], as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bruchez et al [US 6,274,323].

Schultz, Vo-Dinh, and Krauth teach the use of a reference, as discussed above, but fail to teach the use of quantum dots as a reference.

Bruchez et al, however, teach that semiconductor nanocrystals may be used to detect or track a single target, and can be used to in a variety of assays where other, less reliable, labeling methods have typically been used, including fluorescence microscopy, histology, cytology pathology, flow cytometry, FISH, signal amplification assays, DNA and protein sequencing, immunoassays, immunohistochemical analysis, homogeneous assays, high throughput screening, and the like (column 16, lines 58-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to use semiconductor nanocrystals, or quantum dots, instead of a label as a reference in the device of Schultz, Krauth, and Vo-Dinh, as suggested by Bruchez et al, in order to provide a more reliable labeling method.

Double Patenting

18. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 19-20, 25-26, 29-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,710. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent teaches labeled analogues which bind reversibly to a substrate, located within a support, a membrane comprising cellulose acetate (claim 22) that is permeable to an analyte and substantially transparent to excitation wavelengths and emission wavelengths, a dye which absorbs a majority of the excitation and emission wavelengths of the fluorescent label, and a reference (claim 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious that the invention of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,710 is not patentably distinct from the instant invention. The labeled analogues can be glucose analogues (claim 40) and comprise Concanavalin A (claim 14), quantum dots, tracer dyes, and phycobiliproteins (claim 17).

Therefore, it would have been obvious that the invention of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,710 is not patentably distinct from the instant invention.

19. Claims 1-3, 7-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-55 of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,622. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent teaches an analyte permeable membrane that encapsulates a labeled analogue, a reference comprising quantum dots, a dye bound to a binding substrate with an absorption spectrum that has an absorption spectrum that overlaps the excitation and emission spectra of the label (claim 1).

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1641

20. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation a seamless device has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

21. In response to applicant's argument that Krauth [US 4,954,4345] and Vo-Dinh [US 5,864,397] are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Krauth and Vo-Dinh are pertinent in that they both deal with improving the optical detection of analytes, and therefore, would be analogous art, as Shultz also deals with the optical detection of analytes.

22. With respect to applicant's arguments that none of the references teach a molecular imprint, it should be noted that Vo-Dinh teaches the use of a molecular imprint material designed to concentrate specific compounds of interest for improved sensitivity (column 6, lines 63-65), which provides motivation to combine with the Schultz reference, which teaches an anaylyte permeable membrane encapsulating the core sensor elements, and the Krauth reference, which teaches a reference.

23. For these reasons, applicant's arguments have not been found persuasive.

Conclusion

24. No claims are allowed.

25. The following references are also cited as art of interest:


Aebischer et al [US 5,418,154] teach seamless capsules comprising biological material for implantation

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson Yang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long V. Le can be reached on (571)272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nelson Yang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641


LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600
2/17/06